

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicants would like to thank the examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. By the present amendment, claims 1, 3, 5-7, 12-16, and 18-23 remain in the application while claims 1, 3, 5-7, 12-16, and 18-23 have been amended. Claims 2, 4, 8-11, 17, and 24 are canceled and claims 25-30 are newly added to the present application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance.

#### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

It is acknowledged that the “Chinese Office action” has not been considered by the examiner because the date has not been provided. It is respectfully submitted that the “Chinese Office action” is not a prior art reference and the date of the “Chinese Office action” (February 20, 2009 as shown on the document) is irrelevant. The “Chinese Office action” is cited because of its explanation of references cited therein. Thus, the information disclosure statement filed 4/10/09 complies with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98, and MPEP §609.

#### ***Drawings***

Regarding the objection applied to the coupler recited in claim 7, claim 7 has been amended without introducing new matter. The amendment is supported by the disclosure of the specification (see pp. 20, line 17 through pp. 21, line 1). Regarding the objection applied to the state determining circuit and the interference detecting circuit, it is respectfully submitted that both features are shown in Fig. 9B. The reception demodulator (1105) in Fig. 9B may act as the state determining circuit as recited in amended claim 12 (previously recited in canceled claim 17), or the interference detecting circuit as recited in claim 21 (see pp. 24, line 24 through pp. 25, line 8). Thus, the objection as it applies to the drawings is moot.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9-12, 16, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Walker *et al.* US Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0179585 A1, hereinafter “Walker”. The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons, although independent claim 1 has been amended to distinguish further the claimed subject matter from the reference.

Amended independent claim 1, in part, requires “a reception front end for receiving a plurality of pulse signals including at least a first pulse signal and a second pulse signal as a reception signal, wherein a pulse sequence generating time of the second pulse signal is longer than a pulse sequence generating time of the first pulse signal”. By contrast, Walker fails to teach the above-mentioned limitations. The examiner asserted that Walker discloses the above-mentioned limitation in its drawing Fig. 1A. The Walker reference, however, merely teaches pulses centered on different frequencies (see [0060]), instead of different pulse sequence generating times. In fact, the generating times of the pulses in Fig. 1A of the Walker reference are the same (also see Fig. 18 and [0130], “pulse length”). Thus, Walker fails to disclose all limitations as required in claim 1, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 6 and 7 depend from independent claim 1 and are, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons provided in support of the allowability of claim 1.

Claims 2, 9-11, and 24 are canceled in the present application.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Claims 3-5 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker in view of Langford *et al.* US Patent No. 2003/0058971. Claims 3-5 depend from independent

claim 1 and are, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons provided in support of the allowability of claim 1. Claim 8 is canceled in the present application.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

The examiner stated that claims 17-23 contain allowable subject matter. Applicants agree with the examiner. Independent claim 12 has been amended by incorporating all limitations of claim 17. Claims 13-16 and 18-23 are either directly or indirectly dependent from amended independent claim 12. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that claims 12-16 and 18-23 are allowable.

Claims 25-30 have been newly added to the application. Claims 25-30 are patentable as they do not introduce any new matter and define further features not disclosed in or suggested by the cited references.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our  
Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No.: NGB-41334.

Respectfully submitted,  
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: /michaelwgarvey/  
Michael W. Garvey, Reg. No. 35878

1801 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

Date: August 26, 2009